

-----Original Message-----

From: John Mills [mailto:sixbit@mlode.com]

Sent: Sunday, October 06, 2002 2:04 PM

To: Jonas Minton; Anisa Divine; Arnold Whitridge; BJ Miller; Dennis O'Connor; Frances Spivy-Weber; Grace Chan; Gregory S. Weber; Greg Weber; Kamyar Guivetchi; Martha Davis; Nick Di Croce

Subject: post meeting thoughts...

Jonas, Greg, Kamyar and others:

Following last Thursday's AC meeting I had time to reflect on the discussions surrounding the "regional" assessments/plans and the method in which they could be incorporated into the 160 Plan. As I made the long drive home I couldn't get away from some angst over how the regional plans would be developed and used.

I admit in advance to having no special insights or knowledge on these subjects. Rather I'd like to just pass along my thoughts about how the situation stacks up and where we can go from here in a productive fashion. I did not have the advantage of even one glass of wine (driving remember!) so my logic probably suffered.

Let me state my own personal expectation for the plan is that it will form the foundation for action by the legislature and in implementation programs by the administration. To that end I'd like to see the regions "mesh" as transparently as possible.

There are likely to be a maximum of four of the ten hydrologic regions that can put forward something that would functionally serve as a broad plan - in terms of what is out there right now. The remaining 6 regions may have isolated water providers with plans (CIP's) and even some with IRP's but these will not address a majority portion of the region.

Those regions would in effect be silent upon their future plans except for DOF projections and a summary of actions that have taken place in the past to develop and provide water. This would however, not so much be a plan for the future as it would be a repeat of past water management actions against a backdrop of future demand. I suggest that this would place these regions at a disadvantage in identifying conflicts with other regions in the plan, as well as further down the road to implementation of the plan. Additionally, these regions would lack a demonstrated commitment by the State Plan to address their future problems. This is clearly not the fault of the regions which have diligently developed there own solutions, nor is it the fault of other planning processes. It simply reflects the reality of IRP development - at a landscape level - throughout much of the state.

I also recognize that for these regions there is insufficient time and resources to do their planning for them, assuming they were even interested in some entity doing that! As I ruminated on this problem it occurred to me that we could (somewhat) address this problem by including some of the knowledge garnered from the recent discussions about what types of actions were desirable (water management actions) in terms of other planning processes and the legislative process (Prop 204, Prop 13 and this years legislative efforts - discounting Prop 50 as it was not developed by an inclusive legislative process).

In place of no plans for regions which do not have one in place at this time, DWR staff and some of the AC membership could (over the coming months) develop a suite of "water management scenarios" which would serve as a menu of possible water management actions that would be taken in that region to meet the projected demand. These would essentially serve two purposes; 1) they would "fill in" the void for a plan with probable actions based not only on past water management actions but also likely actions in the near future based upon the criteria I mentioned above. 2). they would elicit comments during the public review phase of the plan - from those regions and perhaps initiate a dialogue between key stakeholders in those regions to develop true IRPs for their areas.

This process would have to be explained clearly in an introductory narrative to avoid the criticism that DWR was intruding into local planning processes.

I believe this could be workable (from a scheduling standpoint) inasmuch as these regions would not need to have their "plans" developed until later in the process. Furthermore, as the scenarios were developed there would be an opportunity to examine how the various regions differed and perhaps with minor modification use information from one region in another. This could also save time.

On a similar subject, I believe that the information provided by Chris Williams for the Mountain Counties Water Resources Association was also very helpful. I agree with Chris entirely with his suggestion that water supply options in these areas are significantly different than other regions of the state.

I am however concerned with the addition of an 11th Region with boundaries which are internal to other regions. I can think of examples of management situations, within the regions that Mountain Counties overlie, that are different than in the MCWRA presentation. I am concerned about how these differences could be satisfactorily resolved. The easiest method may be to incorporate the Mountain Counties information and paper as an "overlay" of special circumstances within the existing 10 region structure. Thus, the existing regional structure is unaltered, and yet the MCWRA work is not lost.

Also Greg, we are overdue for a conversation. This week, to reach me leave a message at my office and I'll get back to you. My clients Board of Directors is having their annual Conference this coming week.

Thanks,

John